SESSION #12
2018-02-23
FM2-127

Notes: Nisa and I reviewed constructions I created that Nisa checked with a woman from her community. Nisa and I reviewed her judgments on these constructions, and Nisa also gave her own judgments. Nisa's recording session with her occurred on December 23, 2017. These constructions are investigating the question of whether P, R, and T are equally accessible to syntactic operations (especially across AV and PV).

(41a) Kamu gitaq dagang saq aku bèng kèpèng (41b) Kamu gitaq dagang saq bèng=ku kèpèng (no)
-testing whether R can be extracted into AV from AV. (41a) is straightforward AV case, and (41b) is borderline. In (41b) the agent is interpreted to be dagang and =ku is the R. With *no* it's better

(41c) Kamu gitaq dagang saq siq=ku bèng kèpèng
-testing whether R can be extracted into PV from AV. In 41c the =ku is interpreted as the agent, because it's preverbal

(42a) Kamu gitaq dagang saq ie bèng kèpèng (42b) Kamu gitaq dagang saq=ne bèng kèpèng
-the y both mea the same thing: 'ou saw the seller who he gave the money to'
-42b is better becaue it has a clitic. If you use full pronoun ie as in 42a, there needs to be a context of emphasis for that

(42c) Kamu gitaq dagang saq siq=ne bèng kèpèng
-again (42a,b,c) testing extraction of R into AV from AV, a borderline case, and PV into
-42c feels more complete than 42b because of siq

(43a) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq aku bèng dagang (43b) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq bèng=ku dagang
-both mean about the sqme thing. Sari says 43b is better than 43a. The use of a 'full NP after saq doesn't feel natural"
-42b is "also not the best", according to Nisa. saq=ku beng would be better, because that puts the agent in front of the verb

(43c) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq siq=ku bèng dagang
-examples in (43a,b,c) testing whether T can be extracted into AV from AV, borderline, PV
-43c is the best of the three, because of pre-verbal siq=ku

(44a) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq ie bèng dagang (44b) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq=ne bèng dagang (no)
-a, b, c smean the same thing, but again full NP ie is less preferred. 44b is better with no at the end

(44c) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq bèng=ne dagang
-44b and 44c are the same to Sari. Nisa says 44c puts more emphasis on the verb, becase of post-verbal clitic A

(44d) Kamu gitaq kèpèng saq siq=ne bèng dagang no

-examples in (44a,b,c,d) testing whether T can be extracted into AV from AV, borderline, PV
-44d is better with final no.

SESSION #13
2018-02-23
FM2-127

Overview:

- This session took place during the second half of Session #12, and so it's also on audio file FM2-127
- This elicitation focuses primarily on testing whether R and T can be extracted from various kinds of relative clauses (i.e., PV) into various kinds of matrix clauses (i.e., basic AV and PV clauses).
- Unless noted below an example, Nisa approves of the construction

(1a-4a) set the stage by eliciting basic PV constructions:

(1a) siq=ne bèng aku paoq siq dagang no
'The seller gave me a mango'

(2a) siq=ne bèng aku paoq
'She/he gave me a mango'

-Nisa says the meanings of (1a) and (2a) are the same, and both are OK

(3a) siq=m janjiq dagang no kèpèng
'You promised the seller money'

(4a) siq=ku peritoq kanak no poto no
'I show the child a picture'

-Nisa says both of these are OK constructions too

Examples (1b-4b) test whether T can be extracted from a PV relative clause into a PV matrix clause.

- Yes, T can easily extract from a PV matrix clause, and in fact, when it extracts the preference is to cliticize a pronominal Recipient left behind in the RC

(1b) siq=m kaken paoq [saq siq=ne bèng aku siq dagang no]
'You ate the mango [the seller gave me]'

-Nisa says this is OK. She prefers adding the DEM *no* to the end of a PV relative clause, so I've added no to this example and the following ones.

(1bi) siq=m kaken paoq [saq siq=ne bèng=ku siq dagang no]
'You ate the mango [the seller gave me]'

-Nisa also says cliticizing the R *aku* from (1b) is preferable, in order to sound more natural and put less emphasis on *aku*. She says using the full NP *aku* makes it sound "like you're angry". So (1bi) provides that improved version of (1b).

(2b) siq=m kaken paoq [saq siq=ne bèng aku no]
'You ate the mango [she/he gave me]'

-This is (1b) without the additional final *siq*-phrase. Acceptable.

(2bi) siq=m kaken paoq [saq siq=ne bèng=ku no]
'You ate the mango [she/he gave me]'
-again, this has the cliticized R from (2b) to make it sound more natural

(3b)	siq=ku	paling	kèpèng	[saq	siq=m	janjiq	dagang	no]
	by=1	steal	money	[REL	by=2	promise	seller	DEM]

'I stole the money [that you promised the seller]'
-Nisa added that it's good I confessed to such a crime: "That's very good, you're an honest thief"

(4b) siq=m gitaq poto [saq siq=ku peritoq kanak no]
'You saw the picture [I showed the child]'

Examples (1c-4c) test whether R can be extracted from a PV relative clause into a PV matrix clause.

- Yes, R can easily extract from a PV matrix clause. Unless noted otherwise, Nisa s

(1c) siq=m gitaq dagang [saq siq=ku bèng kèpèng no]
'You saw the seller [who I gave money]'

(2c) siq=ne gitaq dagang [saq siq=ku bèng kèpèng no]
'She/he saw the seller [who I gave money]'

(3c) siq=m kapong kanak [saq siq=ku janjiq paoq no]
'You hugged the child [who I promised a mango]'

(4c) siq=m kapong kanak [saq siq=ku peritoq poto no]
'You hugged the child [who I showed a picture]'

Examples (1d-4d) test whether T can be extracted from an AV relative clause into a PV matrix clause

- No, T cannot be extracted from an AV RC into a PV matrix clause, in a natural-sounding manner. Instead, the preference is to convert the RC into a PV construction or borderline construction (cliticized A but no *siq*-element present). Then T can be extracted.

(1d)	*siq=m	kaken	paoq	[saq	dagang	no	bèng	aku	no]
	by=2	eat	mango	[REL	seller	DEM	give	1SG	DEM]

'You ate the mango that [the seller gave me]'
-Nisa immediately reacted and said this is "not natural". Instead, she prefers the version in (1di).

(1di)	siq=m	kaken	paoq	[saq	siq=ne	bèng=ku	siq	dagang	no]
	by=2	eat	mango	[REL	by=3	give=1SG	by	seller	DEM]

'You ate the mango that [the seller gave me]'
-Nisa said this version is "the most natural ever possible". Here she converts the relative clause to a PV construction, so that the T can be extracted.

(2d) *siq=m kaken paoq saq ie bèng aku

'You ate the mango she/he gave me'

-As with (1d), Nisa shook her head. Says it sounds like a Sasak L2. Again, the preference is to convert the RC to a PV construction (or borderline construction, where A is cliticized but there's no *siq*) in order to enable extraction of T into a PV matrix clause. This is given in (2di).

(2di)	siq=m	kaken	paoq	saq	siq=ne	bèng=ku	no]
	by=2	eat	mango	[REL	by=3	give=1SG	DEM]

'You ate the mango [she/he gave me]'

(3d) *siq=ku paling kèpèng [saq kamu janjiq dagang no]
'I stole the money you promised the seller'

(3di)	siq=ku	paling	kèpèng	[saq=m	janjiq	dagang	no]
	by=1SG	steal	money	[REL=2	promise	seller	DEM]

'I stole the money you promised the seller'

-Nisa prefers this version to (3d). Here the Agent inside the relative clause is cliticized. This makes it what I'm calling a *borderline* construction--not clearly PV or AV because there's no *siq*-element.

(3dii)	siq=ku	paling	kèpèng	[saq	siq=m	janjiq	dagang	no]
	by=1SG	steal	money	[REL	by=2	promise	seller	DEM]

'I stole the money you promised the seller'

-Likewise, converting the RC from (3d) into a clear PV construction makes an acceptable extraction. Furthrmore, Nisa says the "most Ampenan" way to say 'you' is to use the clitic =*mèq* instead of =*m*.

(4d) *siq=m gitaq poto [saq aku peritoq kanak no]
'You saw the picture [I showed the child]'

(4di) siq=m gitaq poto [saq=ku peritoq kanak no]
'You saw the picture [I showed the child]'

-again, borderline construction preferred

(4dii) siq=m gitaq poto [saq siq=ku peritoq kanak no]
'You saw the picture [I showed the child]'

-seems the clear PV version is even more preferable. Nisa said this construction is "awesome"

Examples (1e-4e) test whether R can be extracted from an AV relative clause into a PV matrix clause

- As with T, R cannot be extracted from an AV RC into a PV matrix clause, in a natural-sounding manner. Instead, the preference is to convert the RC into a PV construction or borderline construction (cliticized A but no *siq*-element present). Then R can be extracted.

(1e) *siq=m gitaq dagang [saq aku bèng kèpèng]
'You saw the seller who I gave money'

(1ei) siq=m gitaq dagang [saq siq=ku bèng kèpèng]

-as with T, converting the RC to PV is preferred for extracting R

(2e) *siq=ne gitaq dagang [saq aku bèng kèpèng]
'She/he saw the seller [who I gave money]'

(2ei) siq=ne gitaq dagang [saq=ku bèng kèpèng no]
'She/he saw the seller [who I gave money]'
-again, Nisa prefers at least a borderline RC for extraction of R

(2eii) siq=ne gitaq dagang [saq siq=ku bèng kèpèng no]
'She/he saw the seller [who I gave money]'
-This is the PV version of (2e). Here there may be some inter-speaker variation with the syntax of borderline vs. clear PV: Nisa says that (2ei) and (2eii) are "both good" but that Sari prefers the clearly PV versions with *siq*, as in (2eii).

(3e) *siq=ku kapong kanak [saq kamu janjiq paoq]
'I hugged the child [who you promised a mango]'
-again, need to cliticize the A in the RC. Nisa says "*saq* always wants clitic"

(3f) *siq=ku kapong kanak [saq Udin janjiq paoq]
'I hugged the child who Udin promised the mango'
-Cannot even use a proper name for the agent inside the RC: Nisa says the full name/NP after *saq* "doesn't feel good"

(3gi) siq=ku kapong kanak [saq=ne janjiq paoq siq Udin]
'I hugged the child who Udin promised the mango'
-this one works, because the A is cliticized in the RC

(3gii) siq=ku kapong kanak saq janjiq=ne paoq siq Udin
'I hugged the child who Udin promised the mango'
-this one also works, because the A is cliticized in the RC

(3h) siq=ku kapong kanak saq wah=ne janjiq paoq siq Udin
'I hugged the child who Udin already gave the mango'
-same here too: clitic A means you can extract the R

(4e) *siq=m kapong kanak saq aku peritoq poto no
'You hugged the child who I showed a picture'
-again, no good because of full NP after saq

(4ei) siq=m kapong kanak saq=ku peritoq poto no
'You hugged the child who I showed a picture'

Examples (5a- test extracting P, R, and T from passive RCs into matrix clauses

Setting things up: Examples (5a, 6a) have prototypical ditransitives in AV, and (7a) has a prototypical transitive in AV

(5a) Aku towoq kanak no buaq
'I fed the child fruit'
-both OK

(6a) Guru no bèng kamu buku no
'the teacher gave you the book'

(7a) Kamu bace buku
'You read a book'
-OK

(5b) kanak no te-towoq buaq
'The child was fed fruit'
-(5b, 6b) show it's OK to passivize the R

(6b) Kamu te-bèng buku no
'You were given the book'

(7b) *? buku no te-bace
'The book was read'

(7c) buku te-bace siq kamu
'A book was read by you'
-(7b) is less preferred because te- can also be a proclitic meaning 'we'
-Instead, (7c) is OK, because it removes that ambiguity

(5c) Buaq te-towoq kanak no siq Udin
'Fruit was fed (to) the child by Udin'

(6c) buku te-bèng kamu
'A book was given (to) you'
-In (5c, 6c) T is passivized
-In 6c, the full NP for kamu is "not likely. Better version is buku te-bèng=bi (FEM kamu) or buku te-bèng=ku, with clitic R
-so far P, R, T can all passivize (this is all review, but just double-checking)

Examples (5d-7e) all test whether P, R, T can extract from a passive into a né clause: They all can

(5d) né kanak saq te-towoq buaq no
'This is the child who was fed fruit'
-extracting R into né structure from passive

(6d) né dengan saq te-bèng buku no
'this is the person who was given a book'

(5e) né buaq saq te-towoq kanak no
'This is the fruit that was fed to the child'
-extracting T into a né structure from passive

(6e) né buku saq te-bèng kamu no
'This is the book that was given (to) you

(7e) né buku saq te-bace siq Udin no
'This is the book that was read by Udin
-extracting P into né structure from passive

Examples (5f-6g) all test whether P, R, T can extract from a passive into an AV clause: They all can

(5f) Aku gitaq kanak saq te-towoq buaq no

(6f) kamu kapong dengan saq te-bèng buku no

‘I saw the child who was fed fruit’ ‘you hugged the person who was given a book’
-extracting R into an AV from passive

(7f) inaq=ku beli buku saq te-bace siq Udin no
‘My mother bought the book that was read by Udin’’
-extracting P into an AV clause from passive

(5g) aku beli paoq saq te-towoq kanak no (6g) guru no gitaq buku saq te-bèng kamu no
‘I bought the fruit that was fed (to) the child’ ‘the teacher saw the book that was given (to) you
-extracting T into an AV from passive

Examples (5h-6i) all test whether P, R, T can extract from a passive into an AV clause: They all can

(5h) siq=ku gitaq kanak saq te-towoq buaq no (6h) siq=m kapong dengan saq te-bèng buku no
‘I saw the child who was fed fruit’ ‘you hugged the person who was given a book’
-extracting R into an PV from passive

(7h) siq=ne beli buku saq te-bace siq Udin no
‘She/he bought the book that was read by Udin’
-extracting P into PV from passive

(5i) siq=ku beli paoq saq te-towoq kanak no (6i) siq=ne gitaq buku saq te-bèng kamu no
‘I bought the fruit that was fed (to) the child’ ‘she/he saw the book that was given (to) you
-extracting T into an PV from passive

Lastly, I saw Nisa in the hallway a few hours after our recording session. I asked her about these constructions, in order to test the extractability of A, P from AV into PV.

(8) *siq=m gitaq paoq [saq ie kaken no]
‘You saw the mango she/he ate’
-no extracting P from an AV relative clause into PV matrix clause

(9) siq=m gitaq paoq [saq=ne kaken no]
‘You saw the mango she/he ate’
-Nisa says (9) is better than (8) for extracting P from AV into PV … probably because the relative clause has been converted into a borderline clause

(10) siq=m gitaq paoq [saq siq=ne kaken no]
‘You saw the mango she/he ate’
-Again, the same pattern as with R and T: (10) is the same as (9) for Nisa, where P can exract because the RC has been converted to a clear PV construction

(11) kamu gitaq kanak [saq kaken paoq no]
‘You saw the child who ate the mango’

-This one shows that A can be extracted from AV into an AV clause--different from P, R, T

(12) siq=m gitaq kanak [saq kaken paoq no]
'You saw the child who ate the mango'

-Likewise, A can be extracted from an AV clause into a PV clause

(13) *siq=m gitaq kanak [saq=ne kaken paoq no]
'You saw the child who ate the mango'

-(13) doesn't work because it violates the gap strategy: *kanak* is indexed by the =ne inside the RC

(14) siq=m gitaq kanak [saq gitaq=m no]
'You saw the child [who saw you]'

-this one works, which has an A extracting from a PV clause that has a cliticized P